

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Department of Justice

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

Immigration and Naturalization Service

B2

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

File: WAC 01 245 50629 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **JAN 17 2003**

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Alien of Extraordinary Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(1)(A)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

INSTRUCTIONS:


This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 CFR 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id.*

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 CFR 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS


for Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks classification as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(1)(A), as an alien of extraordinary ability in the arts. The director determined the petitioner had not established the sustained national or international acclaim necessary to qualify for classification as an alien of extraordinary ability.

8 CFR 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part, “[a]n officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.”

On the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, counsel indicates that a brief is being submitted with the appeal. Counsel does not indicate that any further submission is forthcoming. Thus, the brief submitted with the appeal represents the entirety of that appeal.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner is “a well-known artist of oil painter [sic] with extraordinary ability,” and provides a list of awards, exhibitions, and other honors intended to establish that extraordinary ability. A nearly identical list accompanied the initial filing of the petition. The director, in denying the petition, analyzed the evidence of record and explained why the evidence described on the list is not sufficient to establish the petitioner’s eligibility. Counsel, on appeal, offers no rebuttal to any of the director’s specific observations and findings. Counsel simply repeats the list of exhibits and maintains that the petitioner is, “without a doubt,” eligible for the classification sought. Counsel simply ignores the many “doubts” set forth, in detail, in the director’s decision.

Counsel’s brief on appeal contains no specific allegation of error. The director has already stated that the initial evidence is insufficient, and merely repeating a list of that evidence, without even acknowledging the director’s findings regarding that evidence, is not sufficient basis for a substantive appeal.

Inasmuch as counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.